



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,541	12/07/2000	Gregory Zoller	CSCO-68341	4178

7590 03/05/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,541

Applicant(s)

ZOLLER ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on The Amendment dated 2/19/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2171

This is in response to the Amendment dated February 19, 2003

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-9 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in Johnson et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,253,194) in view of Kane et al (U. S. Patent no. 6,389, 429).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claims 1 and 19, Johnson discloses a method of providing access to information comprising the steps of:

a) receiving a call from an application program (see col.2, lines 9-20, Johnson), the call specifying a user identifier (col.7, lines 44-47) and a requested set of information of a plurality of sets of information (col.3, lines 1-5, Johnson), wherein the set of requested information comprises a plurality of fields (col.3, lines 1-3 and lines 38-44, Johnson) and wherein the fields describe information distributed over a plurality of databases (38, Fig. 1 of Johnson);

b) determining the location of the requested information corresponding to the user identifier (col. 7, lines 34-43, Johnson) ;

c) using the user identifier, retrieving information corresponding to a first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 7, lines 44-67, Johnson);

e, providing the set of information to the application program (see col. 1, lines 13-28, Johnson).

Johnson, however, does not explicitly disclose “the mapping of the fields to the databases and retrieving information corresponding to a second of the plurality of fields from a second of the plurality of databases”. Kane, on the other hand, discloses these limitations (see col. 1, line 63 to col. 2, line 19, Kane). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Johnson to include the step of mapping the source fields to the targeted fields as taught by Kane. The motivation of doing so would have been to generate a target database from one or more source databases.

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claims 2 and 20, Johnson/Kane combination further discloses determining the entitlement status corresponding to the user identifier with respect to the set of information (see col. 3, lines 50-58, Kane).

Regarding claims 3 and 22, Johnson/Kane combination further discloses the steps of storing in a cache a set of information that was requested by the application program (see col. 6, lines 8-15, Kane). The combination of Johnson and Kane do not teach, “ a pre-determined time has passed since the set of information was accessed, removing the set of information from the cache”. But, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Johnson and Kane to remove the information from cache or be kick off from the web when the pre-determined time has been out because it is for the security reason and system's efficiency.

Regarding claims 4-6 and 21, Johnson/Kane combination further discloses the step of updating a first of the plurality of fields in the set of the information by writing information to a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 2, line 42 to col. 3, line 35, Kane).

Regarding claim 7, Johnson/Kane combination further discloses a first database with entitlement information thereon and a second database with user profile information thereon (see col. 4, lines 21-34, Kane).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 8, Johnson/Kane combination further discloses the steps of providing a parameter to the application program and the application program passing the parameter when requesting user profile data (see col. 13, lines 8-13 and 41-46, Kane).

Regarding claim 9, Johnson/Kane combination further discloses the step of moving the information corresponding to a first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases to a second of the plurality of databases (col. 13, lines 37-55, Kane).

Regarding claims 23-24, Johnson/Kane combination further discloses that requested set of information comprises information relating to a single user and a group of users (see col. 4, lines 21-35, Kane).

Claims 10-18 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sehr (U. S. Patent no. 6,085,976) in view of Kane et al (U. S. Patent no. 6,389, 429).

Regarding claims 10, 16 and 25, Sehr discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon program instructions for providing access to information stored on a plurality of databases:

- the program further operable to process requests from an application program, the requests identifying a first of the plurality of logical collections of the information and a first of a plurality of users (column 6, lines 1-10, Sehr);

• Art Unit: 2171

- the program further operable to retrieve the information corresponding to the at least the first of the plurality of fields, the information corresponding to the user identified by the request from the application program (column 5, lines 44-49 and column 34, lines 1-8, Sehr).

Sehr, however, does not explicitly disclose the logical mapping and physical mapping of the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases. Kane, on the other hand, the mapping of the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases (see col. 2, lines 1-19; column 6, lines 14-19 and lines 19-22). At machine level like the system of Kane have to have physical address to locate an physical record (see col. 2, lines 20-41, Kane), and a record have to have the identification (see col. 2, line 42 to col. 3, line 35, Kane) to specify the record that is logical mapping of the records. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sehr to include the logically and physically map of the records as taught by Kane. The motivation of doing so would have been to manipulate information.

Regarding claim 11, Sehr/Kane combination further discloses the computer wherein the plurality of databases comprises a first database and a second database (column 5, lines 12-15, Sehr).

Regarding claim 12, Sehr/Kane combination further discloses the computer wherein the first database comprises entitlement information (see col. 3, lines 59-62, Sehr).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 13, Sehr/Kane combination further discloses the second database comprises user profile information (see col. 5, lines 64-67, Sehr).

Regarding claims 14 and 26, Sehr/Kane combination further discloses the steps of storing in a cache a set of information that was requested by the application program (see col. 6, lines 8-15, Kane). The combination of Sehr and Kane do not teach, “ a pre-determined time has passed since the set of information was accessed, removing the set of information from the cache”. But, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Sehr and Kane to remove the information from cache or be kick off from the web when the pre-determined time has been out because it is for the security reason and system's efficiency.

Regarding claims 15 and 27, Sehr/Kane combination further discloses operable program to update the information for the first of the logical collections of the information by writing to a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 2, line 42 to col. 3, line35, Kane).

Regarding claim 17, Sehr/Kane combination further discloses the information relates to a single user (column 5, lines 64-67, Sehr).

Regarding claim 18, Sehr/Kane combination further discloses the information pertaining to a group of users (column 5, line 67 to column 6, lines 1, Sehr).

Art Unit: 2171

Response to Arguments


Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9099 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai 
Art Unit 2171
March 2, 2003

**SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**